



Joint Policy Committee

December 17, 2004

10:00 a.m.

Nile Hall—Preservation Park
668 13th Street
Oakland, California

AGENDA

1. Welcome, Introductions and Opening Remarks
2. Approval of Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of November 19, 2004 (attached) Action
3. Transportation 2030 Discussion

SB 849 requires that the JPC coordinate the development and drafting of major regional planning documents, including the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), beginning with the 2008 revision. The 2005 RTP, *Transportation 2030*, has been released for final public comment. MTC staff will provide an overview of the RTP with emphasis on the transportation/land-use interface. At this late stage, there is very limited opportunity to influence the 2005 RTP. However, the JPC may want to respond to this overview with some initial thoughts about how it wishes to approach the 2008 revision.
4. Advocating the Regional Interest through Major Plan and Project Review (attached) Discussion and Action

Staff has prepared a discussion paper looking at the feasibility of reviving the process of actively reviewing local plans and projects of regional significance. The paper recommends a limited regional comment process, focusing on providing support for plans and projects that pursue the region's smart-growth interests.
5. Meeting Frequency and Length Discussion

Commissioner Rubin has requested that the Committee discuss meeting frequency and the length of time allotted for presentation and discussion of items.
6. Other Business
7. Public Comment

ITEM 2



**Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
P. O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Joint Policy Committee / Regional Planning Program

ABAG-MTC Joint Policy Committee

Minutes of the Meeting of November 19, 2004
Held at 9:00 a.m. in MetroCenter Room 171

Attendance:

ABAG members:

Dave Cortese
Mark Green
Scott Haggerty (Chair)
Rose Jacobs Gibson
Steve Rabinowitsh
Gwen Regalia

MTC members:

Mark DeSaulnier
Steve Kinsey
Sue Lempert
John McLemore
Jon Rubin (Chair)
Jim Spering
Shelia Young

ABAG staff:

Alex Amoroso
Paul Fassinger
Henry Gardner
Clarke Howatt
Patricia Jones
Kenneth Moy
Janet McBride
Christy Riviere

MTC staff:

James Corless
Steve Heminger
Doug Kimsey
Valerie Knepper
Therese McMillan
Bruce Riordan

JPC staff:

Ted Droettboom

Other:

Jack Broadbent, BAAQMD
Stuart Cohen, Transportation and Land Use Coalition
Dana Cowell, Caltrans
Linda Craig, League of Women Voters
Duane De Witt
Nashua Kalil, BART
Seth Kaplan, Alameda County Supervisor Nathan Miley
Thomas Krouemeyer, Marin TAM
Sherman Lewis, Sierra Club
Peter Lydon, SPUR
Dan Phelan
Shelley Poticha, Center for Transit-Oriented Development
Geeta Rao, NPH
Jean Roggenkamp, BAAQMD
David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF
Doug Shoemaker, MTC Advisory Council

Janet Spilman, SCTA
Karen Stove
Leslie Stewart, Bay Area Monitor
Sandra Threlfall, Waterfront Action

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The chair opened the meeting with a welcome, and those in attendance introduced themselves.

2. Approval of Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of October 22, 2004

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3. Recent Housing Legislation

ABAG Principal Planner Alex Amoroso reviewed new laws affecting the Housing Element in local General Plans and the Regional Housing Needs Allocation. In general, the new laws clarify and support a close relationship between housing allocation and other regional smart-growth objectives. They also facilitate and protect the approval of housing projects that are consistent with local general plans, but may impose minimum density requirements on localities that do not allow for sufficient new housing in their plans.

Mr. Amoroso alerted the Committee that the State was considering requiring that local governments plan for housing twenty years in advance, not just five years as presently. He also indicated that there is a possibility that State funding for the Regional Housing Needs Allocation process may be terminated, with the result that affected local governments may have to fund the COG to do this work.

4. Transit Oriented Development—Preliminary Policy

MTC Senior Planner James Corless presented preliminary policy ideas for conditioning Resolution 3434 transit expansions on supportive developments. Core policy concepts include:

- Planning for supportive development by corridor, with the potential to trade off specific development objectives among stations, so long as the corridor as a whole performs satisfactorily;
- Using planned residential population or planned population plus planned jobs within ½ mile of stations as the principal performance criteria for determining the level of supportive development, with criteria thresholds to vary by transit technology;

- Requiring qualitative, as well as numerical, criteria to evaluate the likelihood that station areas will deliver riders, function as viable transit villages, and get developed as planned;
- Recognition that localities can only plan for development; that actual development is subject to market and other forces beyond the control of local governments;.
- Recognition that supportive development will require good local specific planning, which MTC proposes to fund.
- A willingness to support station area plan implementation with TLC and HIP funds.
- Coordination of land use planning and transportation project planning through a series of contingent decisions.

In discussion, a number of issues were identified, including:

- The difficulty, but necessity, of planning corridors involving multiple jurisdictions and involving actors from all sectors (including business and development interests), some of whom may be suspected and disrespected because they have an interest in the outcome;
- The necessity to plan for both origins (residential locations) and destinations (employment locations) on transit lines, therefore using both population and jobs as development criteria—but also noting and emphasizing that the region does not have a shortage of employment locations; it does have a shortage of affordable housing;
- The requirement that other criteria in addition to supportive land use be used in evaluating and conditioning transit investments; for example the quality of connectivity with other transit systems and the associated ability to generate ridership from a larger catchment area;
- The probable perception among some localities that this policy is a heavy-handed attempt by the region to tell them how to plan and for what to plan;
- The responsibility the region has not to plan just to maximize fare box revenue but to achieve all the other environmental and quality-of-life objectives associated with regional livability and smart growth,

- The possibility that good intentions embodied in paper plans may erode under public pressure once transit is built and that the actual development upon which the transit investment is predicated may not appear, leading to possibility that the region may have to find some mechanism to hold localities accountable for their promises;
- The need to plan for a broader area around specific station areas to ensure that required infrastructure and level of service on adjacent roads and intersections is capable of supporting both the new development and the traffic generated by transit;
- The likelihood that local jurisdictions and surrounding neighbors will need more persuasive arguments and perhaps tangible incentives to convince them that there is some benefit to them in accepting higher-density development around transit stations (It has to be demonstrated that this improves everyone's quality of life);
- The requirements that some jurisdictions may have for technical assistance and perhaps even regional review;
- The possibility that some transit-unfriendly uses (e.g., big box retail) may have to be prohibited from station areas;
- The requirement that some TOD planning occur quite quickly as some transit investments are nearly ready to proceed;
- The desirability of planning for a good mix of uses, a high quality of urban design and an attractive and efficient integration of public and private investment at each station so that the resultant neighborhoods are attractive and well-functioning communities, not just transit feeders.

5. SB 849—Composition of the JPC

It was moved and seconded, and it was the decision of the Committee:

THAT the Bay Area Air Quality District (BAAQMD) be invited to appoint seven members to the Joint Policy Committee, increasing the Committee's voting membership from fourteen to twenty-one members;

THAT the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing be invited to appoint an *ex officio* member to the Joint Policy Committee;

THAT size and composition of the Joint Policy Committee be reviewed after one year;

THAT the Committee chair rotate among member agencies, the chair or president of each agency serving a one-year term as chair of the JPC, in this order: ABAG, MTC, BAAQMD.

6. Other Business

Future presentations on BART station-area development policies, on Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), and on development incentives were requested.

A member also requested that at the next JPC meeting there be a discussion of meeting length and frequency.

Henry Gardner's appointment as the new Executive Director of ABAG was announced.

7. Public Comment

A member of the public raised concerns about the regional public involvement process, about implementation of the TLC program and about the level of transit service from Marin County.

ITEM 4



Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/

Joint Policy Committee / Regional Planning Program

Date: December 6, 2004

To: Joint Policy Committee

From: Regional Planning Program Director

Subject: Advocating the Regional Interest through Major Plan and Project Review

During my summer round of meetings with individual Joint Policy Committee (JPC) members, several members indicated an interest in the region reviewing and providing comment on major plans or projects. The members argued that regional review would help ensure that local governments and other agencies took regional objectives into account when planning or approving significant developments or infrastructure investments. The JPC has recognized regional review as one tool for pursuing the *Smart Growth Strategy/Regional Livability Footprint* vision and has directed that a consideration of review mechanisms be included in the Regional Planning work program.

This memorandum describes the present means by which the region informs itself of potentially significant plans and projects, compares the present processes to past efforts at regional review and to the processes employed by another major California regional agency. It concludes by recommending a limited program of regional comments in support of local smart-growth initiatives. The memorandum also makes corollary observations and recommendations about local confirmation of the regional vision.

Learning about Major Plans and Projects: The Regional Clearinghouses

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) operates two “clearinghouses” for collecting and disseminating information on major plans or projects occurring within the region.

The first clearinghouse is called Intergovernmental Review, and is sometimes referred to with the acronym “IGR” or with the anachronistic “A-95 Review.” The “A-95” comes from U.S. Office of Management and Budget “Circular A-95,” which was issued in 1969 to implement the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968. A-95 required all local requests for federal categorical grants (covering nearly 150 programs) to be reviewed by a regional planning agency for consistency with regional plans.

In 1983, the Reagan administration replaced A-95 with the much less onerous Executive Order 12375. The new federal guidelines allowed states to organize their own intergovernmental review processes. In California, the State requires that federal grant applicants submit an information form to a State Clearinghouse and to an Area-wide Clearinghouse. The Area-wide Clearinghouse for the Bay Area is ABAG. State agencies or Area-wide Clearinghouses have thirty days in which to submit a Notice of Intent to Comment to the State Clearinghouse. If an

agency or Clearinghouse wishes to comment, it must obtain the complete grant application from the applicant and must submit its comments to the State Clearinghouse no later than fifty-five days from the date of the State Clearinghouse's initiation of the review.

ABAG publishes a monthly newsletter that lists IGR applications, averaging between one and four applications per month. The newsletter provides a very brief project description and invites comments. Typically ABAG does not comment itself, and it receives very few comments from others. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) scans the application list for consistency with the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and has, on occasion, provided comments to sponsors.

The second clearinghouse occurs because of section 15206 of the guidelines issued for the administration of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The CEQA guidelines require that draft Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) or Negative Declarations be submitted to the metropolitan council of governments (i.e., ABAG in the Bay Area) for review and comment if the lead agency (usually a local government, state department, or regional agency) determines the plan or project fits within one or more of a number of descriptions. These include:

- A proposed local general plan, element, or plan amendment for which an EIR has been prepared;
- A project which has the potential for causing significant effects on the environment (e.g., traffic, air quality) extending beyond the city or county in which the project would be located, specifically including:
 - A proposed residential development of more than 500 units,
 - A proposed shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons or encompassing more than 500,000 square feet of floor space,
 - A proposed commercial office building employing more than 1,000 persons or encompassing more than 250,000 square feet of floor space,
 - A proposed hotel/motel development of more than 500 rooms,
 - A proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or encompassing more than 650,000 square feet of floor area;
- A project which would result in the cancellation of an open space contract made as a result of California Land Conservation Act of 1965 for any parcel of 100 or more acres;
- A project for which an EIR and not a Negative Declaration was prepared which would be located in and would substantially impact an area of critical environmental sensitivity, including within or adjacent the Bay Area:

- The California Coastal Zone,
- An area within ¼ mile of a wild and scenic river as defined by the Public Resources Code,
- The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta,
- The Suisun March,
- The jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission;
- A project which would substantially affect sensitive wildlife habitats (riparian lands, wetlands, bays, estuaries, marshes, and habitats of endangered, rare and threatened species);
- A project which would interfere with attainment of regional water quality standards as stated in the approved area-wide waste treatment management plan;
- A project which would provide housing, jobs, or occupancy for 500 or more people within 10 miles of a nuclear power plant.

ABAG compiles the titles of submitted CEQA documents in an Environmental Review Log and files the environmental documents themselves in the MTC-ABAG library. The average monthly Environmental Review Log contains between ten and thirty entries and is distributed in the same manner as the Intergovernmental Review Newsletter. Citing resource constraints, ABAG does no systematic review or analysis of the submitted EIRs or Negative Declarations and does not routinely provide comment to lead agencies, except for those plans or projects affecting the Bay Area Trail. Occasionally MTC staff will also comment on a project. The compilation of the Log, like the compilation of the IGR Newsletter, is essentially a clerical function. The use that recipients make of the Log or of the IGR Newsletter has not been surveyed, and the library's collection of EIR documents appears to be more archival than active

ABAG is by no means alone among regional planning agencies in the nominal nature of its Intergovernmental Review process. A survey of major Council of Government (COG) and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) web sites from around the country found that most did not even reference the clearinghouse or intergovernmental review process as an agency activity; and, among those who did, only a couple did anything substantive with the information collected.

Plan and Project Review in the Past: A Key Regional Planning Tool

Regional review was not always such a low-key, low-impact activity in the Bay Area. Staff members who were here in the seventies speak of it as one of the most important and influential things the region, and ABAG in particular, did. It is also credited with winning ABAG several awards and with encouraging a close working relationship with MTC and BAAQMD.

In 1980, ABAG published a *Regional Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area*, which identified the regional review of local plans and projects as one of three principal implementation actions. The other implementation actions were service and advocacy. The regional plan itself, first published in 1970, postulated a “city-centered concept” not terribly different from the smart-growth vision which is driving present-day regional planning thought.

In addition to reviewing A-95 projects and draft EIRs, ABAG also had a procedure to vet any project which was deemed to potentially conflict with or violate the *Regional Plan* or its adopted elements. A project could be brought before the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) at the request of a local government, through referral by the Executive Board or any standing committee, or by staff request. The RPC could then appoint a review panel of three or five of its members to determine whether a review should be undertaken. Alternatively, the entire RPC could determine whether or not to undertake a review. The recommendation of the review panel or the RPC was forwarded to the Executive Board, who could then direct the RPC to actually undertake the review with the assistance of ABAG staff and the staff of other agencies.

The most celebrated review done under this procedure was that of the Las Positas project, a proposed new town in Alameda County. A regional review was requested by the neighboring City of Livermore in 1975. After what is described as “a tense debate,” the ABAG Executive Board voted 23 to 2 to ratify the RPC comment that the project was premature and would have negative effects on local schools, air quality and ground water. The meeting culminated with an Alameda County Supervisor threatening to pursue secession from ABAG. Ultimately the County did not cancel its ABAG membership, and its Board of Supervisors also voted not to approve the project.

While 1975 was a high point for regional review, by the mid-eighties the process had withered away. A number of factors are blamed: the decline in federal funding, the replacement of OMB Circular A-95 with Executive Order 12375, and the implementation of Proposition 13. Over a very short period, ABAG lost its 208 grant from EPA and its Section 701 funds from HUD. Simultaneously, it had to reduce its membership fees because of Proposition 13. In today’s dollars, the net loss was greater than ABAG’s current budget and was effected through a three-year staff reduction from 125 to 28. Subsequently the *Regional Plan*, last updated in 1992, also disappeared from currency, to be reincarnated only recently in the *Smart Growth Strategy/Regional Livability Footprint Project*.

Toward the end, as funding and interest declined, the intergovernmental review process became increasingly formalistic and irrelevant. The process was referred to by staff as the “log roll,” indicative of the truth that it had lost much of its initial legitimacy, credibility and efficacy and had become largely a cat-and-mouse game played between regional staff and the environmental consultants hired by development proponents. Cookie-cutter comments were met with cookie-cutter responses, with everyone aware that the process did not make much difference anyway—particularly when lead agencies, under tremendous pressure to achieve tax-paying development, did not have many degrees of freedom to relocate or otherwise reconfigure projects to make them less sprawl-inducing or environmentally unfriendly. In a context where everyone knew that regional comments were only advisory anyway, little real influence was perceived.

Regional Review at the Southern California Association of Governments: Maybe Making a Difference

The COG and MPO for California's largest metropolitan area is the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Unlike ABAG, SCAG still comments on plans and projects, though there is little or no political or public involvement in the identification of regionally significant items, the analysis of impacts, or the preparation of comments. This is almost entirely a staff activity.

Last year, SCAG received 727 project documents and deemed 107 of these to be regionally significant, based principally on application of the CEQA guidelines, but also including some transportation, wastewater, hazardous waste, solid waste and infrastructure projects not recognized by CEQA. Staff (one planner and an assistant, occasionally augmented by substantive specialists) analyzes regionally significant projects for consistency with the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) and conformity with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and provides comments to lead agencies. The lead agencies are under no obligation to do anything in response to SCAG's comments. Compliance, if any, is entirely voluntary. The staff believes, however, that its comments do have an impact. This is based on receiving an increasing number of documents that anticipate SCAG concerns and attempt to mitigate prior to review. The staff also credits the advance mitigation of regional concerns with its ability to manage an increasing number of project submissions with limited regional resources.

The principal basis for SCAG's review is the RCPG. This is a comprehensive compendium of regional analyses and policies and is nearly two inches thick. It was last published in March of 1996, though there is currently an update underway. It has considerably less public profile than SCAG's RTP (currently entitled *Destination 2030*, and similar in concept to MTC's *Transportation 2030*). SCAG is also working on a regional vision, *Compass*, but this plays no current role in the review process.

The RCPG's chapters fall into three categories: core, ancillary and bridge. Core chapters include Growth Management, Regional Mobility, Air Quality, Hazardous Waste Management, and Water Quality. These respond directly to federal and state planning requirements of local government. Ancillary chapters are Economy, Housing, Human Resources and Services, Finance, Open Space and Conservation, Water Resources, Energy and Integrated Solid Waste Management. Bridge chapters are Strategy and Implementation. Only the core chapters are used in plan and project review. SCAG also has a process by which it can delegate review responsibilities to sub-regional agencies or local governments whose plans are consistent with the core chapters of the RCPG.

In addition to providing comment to lead agencies, the SCAG review staff publishes a glossy annual report of review activity. This provides an overview of major developments and public investments in the region and is reportedly popular among both public and private sector recipients.

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) engages in a staff-driven process similar to SCAG's but with less publicly accessible product. The SANDAG review and

comment process is budgeted for a little less than \$200,000 annually. In Sacramento, SACOG does not budget or program for active intergovernmental review.

Reviving Regional Review in the Bay Area

In preparing this memo, I spent a great deal of time and effort with past and present regional staff considering options for returning the major plan and project review process to something approximating the form, profile and effectiveness of its glory days in the seventies.

Two factors favor a revival:

1. CEQA

If, like most COGs across the nation, ABAG only had available to it information on major projects requiring federal grants, regional review would have limited utility as a planning tool. It would only provide routine access to a small subset of the major projects that act to set the course of regional development, most notably in the transportation field. However, the CEQA guidelines provide a unique California opportunity to review and comment on a much larger group of context-setting plans and projects in both the public and private sectors.

2. Smart Growth Strategy

Until recently, regional review and comment on any plan or project would be of arguable legitimacy and therefore of questionable effectiveness. Without a current *Regional Plan* and without a clear regional development strategy with which to focus its analysis and upon which to ground its comments, the region would essentially be taking extemporaneous pot shots or bestowing makeshift compliments with no more basis or standing than any other *ad hoc* participant in the environmental review process.

Now, however, the *Smart Growth Preamble and Policies* (Appendix)—formally adopted by ABAG, MTC, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)—provide a consolidated statement of the region's objectives. By embracing a set of regional development policies, derived from a comprehensive and inclusive regional visioning process, the region has established an overt standing to review and comment in defined areas of regional interest.

There are, however, a number of issues to be confronted in developing a new process that is relevant and effective. Among these are the relative roles of elected officials, regional staff and citizen advisors; the constrained timelines for some CEQA reviews; the appropriate point of intervention in local plans and projects; identification of plans and projects of truly regional significance, the relative impact of major projects versus cumulative change; the maintenance of consistency and objectivity in project selection and analysis, and the possibility of game-playing such as that which plagued the declining days of regional review in the eighties.

We are able to develop what we believe are workable strategies for most of the challenges. There are, though, two issues that are particularly difficult and sway us away—at least for now—from recommending a return to a large-scale, comprehensive regional review process comparable to the process that prevailed in the Bay Area during the seventies. We also cannot recommend a more low-key, staff-driven process such as that employed by SCAG and SANDAG. The two issues are:

1. Resources

Any way we cut it, we cannot envision a regional review process, encompassing all regionally significant plans and projects, which would not cost at least \$200,000 a year or require that at least two full-time professional staff be reallocated from other planning work. Much greater resources would be required were there to be any significant level of political or stakeholder involvement in the review process and were we to go beyond the fairly formulaic SCAG and SANDAG approaches. At a time of continuing local government fiscal distress, we are not comfortable in recommending a large resource allocation to what some would perceive as a process of second-guessing local government planning and decision-making.

2. Criticism Model

The phenomenon of second-guessing plays a big role in this issue as well. Regional review, as it is traditionally conceived, is based on a criticism model. Projects are typically vetted for review because they are seen to potentially “conflict with or violate” the regional plan. There is an implicit assumption that “we know better than you do,” that without wise regional review, local governments will not be aware of regional impact and will make planning and development decisions counter to the regional interest. While this may be true in a limited number of cases, there is evidence of an emerging local-government consensus around common smart-growth principles. Increasingly, local governments do not need to be reminded of these principles; they only need assistance in applying them. The traditional regional review model, with its fault-finding bias, is not appropriate for this purpose.

I recently spoke with a representative group of local planning directors about the regional vision and its application at the local level. The planners confirmed an earlier ABAG research finding that nearly all local governments have bought into smart growth principles (at least nominally) and many are proceeding to encourage and implement higher density development. Awareness and understanding of the region’s smart-growth policies are not obstacles to regionally supportive development. What gets in the way are the lack of resources required to plan smart development well (It is more complicated and difficult to do than sprawl.) and NIMBYism (Neighbors are unconvinced of the benefits of smart developments, particularly when contextual planning is incomplete.) To overcome these obstacles, local governments do not need regional planners looking over their shoulders. They do need positive assistance from regional *partners*.

The local planners also directly questioned the wisdom of the region seeking local confirmation of the regional vision, as contemplated in the initial JPC work program. They looked upon confirmation as “preaching to the converted,” noting that there already is remarkable local-

government consensus around smart-growth ideas. This consensus could be damaged by a confirmation process centered on a specific *Network of Neighborhoods* footprint, particularly if it were seen to require or even imply the allocation of growth numbers among municipalities. The planning directors emphasized that neither more discussion of general growth principles nor local buy-in to a more specific regional growth allocation would be particularly helpful at this time. They would rather see regional resources put to other purposes. What they required was regional assistance in getting local smart-growth planning done and smarter projects approved and built. The proof of the regional vision was no longer in consent but in execution, in getting positive examples happening on the ground and in building on those tangible successes. Regional support and incentives were key words.

The JPC will be considering incentives, most of which involve the expenditure of dollars, at future meetings. In the interim and over the longer term as well, the JPC can lend its positive support to a few carefully selected local plans and projects that further the smart-growth vision and exemplify efficient use of the region's land supply and existing public infrastructure. Well constructed regional arguments that help dissuade local fears and that provide a thoughtful, analytical and persuasive counterbalance to knee-jerk NIMBYism may contribute to achieving some smart-growth success stories, and begin solving some real regional problems like the shortage of affordable housing.

The provision of supportive comments for a relatively small and strategic set of smart-growth plans or projects does not meet the comprehensive plan and project review ideal espoused in the seventies, and it will mean remaining silent on a number of regionally significant projects—particularly on some that are less supportive and maybe even antagonistic of the regional vision. However, it is likely doable with existing resources (particularly if those resources are not consumed with a lengthy vision confirmation process), will not be perceived as negative and confrontational second-guessing, and will help build a set of real development examples which can over time be held up as positive and livable alternatives to environmentally insensitive and economically inefficient sprawl.

Recommendation

I recommend:

- A. THAT, on a continuing basis, staff identify particularly significant local plans and projects that could benefit from regional support and bring forth draft comments for the JPC's approval and then transmission to relevant local authorities;
- B. THAT the members of the JPC, representing a wide spectrum of local governments, also use their local knowledge to identify significant smart growth initiatives requiring supportive comments, and that there be a recurring JPC agenda item for this purpose;
- C. THAT there be no further efforts at achieving formal local confirmation of the regional vision at this time.

Appendix

Smart Growth Preamble and Policies

Preamble

Current land-use patterns in the San Francisco Bay Area are putting intense pressure on the economic, environmental and social wellbeing of the Bay Area and of surrounding regions. The projected addition of over one million new residents and one million new jobs in the coming decades will further challenge our ability to sustain the high quality of life we enjoy today.

To help meet this challenge, the five regional agencies of the Bay Region—the Association of Bay Area Governments, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Regional Water Quality Control Board—along with the economy, environment and social equity caucuses of the Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities, developed a set of Smart Growth policies.

The policies reflect the values articulated by workshop participants of the Smart Growth Strategy/Regional Livability Footprint Project and address Bay Area conditions. The policies are consistent with widely accepted notions of smart growth. They are meant to encourage meaningful participation from local governments, stakeholders and residents.

The policies provide a framework for decision-making on development patterns, housing, transportation, environment, infrastructure, governmental fiscal health and social equity that can lead us toward development of vibrant neighborhoods, preservation of open space, clean air and water, and enhanced mobility choices, while enhancing the Bay Area's relationship with surrounding regions.

Policies

Jobs/Housing Balance and Match

Improve the jobs/housing linkages through the development of housing in proximity to jobs, and both in proximity to public transportation. Increase the supply of affordable housing and support efforts to match job income and housing affordability levels.

Housing and Displacement

Improve existing housing and develop sufficient new housing to provide for the housing needs of the Bay Area community. Support efforts to improve housing affordability and limit the displacement of existing residents and businesses.

Social Justice and Equity

Improve conditions in disadvantaged neighborhoods, ensure environmental justice, and increase access to jobs, housing, and public services for all residents in the region.

Appendix continued...

Environmental, Natural Resource, Open Space and Agricultural Preservation

Protect and enhance open space, agricultural lands, other valued lands, watersheds and ecosystems throughout the region. Promote development patterns that protect and improve air quality. Protect and enhance the San Francisco Bay and Estuary.

Mobility, Livability and Transit Support

Enhance community livability by promoting in-fill, transit oriented and walkable communities, and compact development as appropriate. Develop multi-family housing, mixed-use development, and alternative transportation to improve opportunities for all members of the community.

Local and Regional Transportation Efficiencies

Promote opportunities for transit use and alternative modes of transportation including improved rail, bus, high occupancy (HOV) systems, and ferry services as well as enhanced walking and biking. Increase connectivity between and strengthen alternative modes of transportation, including improved rail, bus, ride share and ferry services as well as walking and biking. Promote investments that adequately maintain the existing transportation system and improve the efficiency of transportation infrastructure.

Infrastructure Investments

Improve and maintain existing infrastructure and support future investments that promote smart growth, including water and land recycling, brownfield clean-up and re-use, multi-use and school facilities, smart building codes, retention of historic character and resources, and educational improvements.

Local Government Fiscal Health

Improve the fiscal health of local government by promoting stable and secure revenue sources, reduced service provision costs through smart growth targeted infrastructure improvement, and state and regional sponsored fiscal incentives. Support cooperative efforts among local jurisdictions to address housing and commercial development, infrastructure costs, and provision of services.

Cooperation on Smart Growth Policies

Encourage local governments, stakeholders and other constituents in the Bay Area to cooperate in supporting actions consistent with the adopted Smart Growth policies. Forge cooperative relationships with governments and stakeholders in surrounding regions to support actions that will lead to inter-regional Smart Growth benefits